

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT ALL-COMMITTEE WORKSHOP MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND INDUSTRY, SEATTLE, WA JUNE 13, 2001 — 9:30 A.M. – 4:00 P.M.**

#### **INTRODUCTION, WELCOME, AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, reviewed the agenda. The purpose of the workshop was to understand environmental findings and impacts, and local traffic and freeway operations based on the modeling of the various alternatives. No changes were made to the agenda.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS**

Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, introduced the key environmental analysts who would be discussing the potential environmental impacts. The impacts to the most important resources along the corridor will be helpful in differentiating between the alternatives. The impacts are divided into the following categories: natural environment (wetlands, streams, fisheries); built environment (parks and 4(f) issues); noise; and displacements. The summary of environmental findings is contained in the environmental chapter of the multi-modal alternatives evaluation report, and more detailed information is available from the team if desired.

#### **WETLANDS, SHORELINES, PRIORITY HABITATS AND SPECIES, FISHERIES**

Don Weitkamp, Parametrix, and Margaret Clancy, Parametrix, reviewed the impacts to the natural environment, including wetlands, shorelines, priority habitats and species, and fisheries. Margaret Clancy stated that the analysis focused on four questions:

- What are the resources?
- Where are the resources?
- How will they be affected?
- Are there opportunities to avoid, offset, or rectify impacts?

Margaret Clancy discussed definitions for shorelines, priority habitats, and wetlands. Habitat considerations include screening criteria for priority habitat and the presence of species. The Endangered Species Act (ESA) and regulatory permit issues will help shape a major part of the project. Permit issues include both national and local regulations for filling wetlands, water

quality, shorelines management act, and sensitive and critical areas ordinances. She then walked through the corridor and discussed impacts local to each geographic area. Points noted in that part of the presentation include:

- ESA issues focus on Chinook salmon. Protection of Chinook habitat implies protection of other similar habitats. Bull trout are the only other ESA-listed fisheries species present.
- Chinook generally don't rear in lakes, as they dislike aquatic vegetation and like a gravelly bottom environment.
- Impacts in the area from Portage Bay to the University Bridge affect primarily predator/competitor habitat for the Chinook.
- A ship canal tunnel crossing is not of great concern for impacts to the natural environment.
- Removal of piles and shifting the bridge away from the shoreline will improve Chinook habitat.
- Eastside areas of concern include the wetlands and bald eagle habitat at Yarrow Bay and Cozy Cove, Fairweather Creek, Mercer Slough, riparian wetlands on Kelsey Creek and Richards Creek, Goff Creek and Valley Creek Wetlands, the Sammamish River and Bear Creek.
- The HCT alignment is set along the west side of Bellevue Way to minimize impacts to Mercer Slough.

Don Weitkamp reviewed the fisheries impacts, noting the following:

- Eastside stream culvert removal would be good for Chinook habitat.
- Bear Creek contains a population of at least 200 adult Chinook salmon.
- In the Puget Sound Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) and Lake Washington watershed, the potential for riparian habitat could be affected by some of the alternatives.
- Sensitive areas between Bear Creek and Marymoor Park represent a major project constraint.

In summary, for fisheries:

- All alternatives have same types of impact though impacts differ by degree.
- The difference in width has implications on shoreline crossings and encroachment on Bear Creek riparian habitat.
- Water quality impacts are not a differentiating factor - wider roadways mean more water must be treated.

In summary, for wetlands:

- A wider footprint means greater impacts.
- Impacts range from 4.7 acres (alternative 2) to 21.6 acres (alternative 6).
- Alternatives 3 through 8 are rated 'most' impacts.
- Alternative 2 has least impacts, but HCT affects Bear Creek and Sammamish River areas.
- Large wetlands with important social value exist in the corridor.
- There are potential impacts to existing restoration and mitigation sites.

- Wetlands are associated with salmon streams.
- Impacts may be difficult to mitigate.

In summary, for priority habitats and species:

- Impacts are strongly correlated with wetland impacts.
- Alternatives 2,3,5,7 are rated 'medium.'
- Alternatives 4,6,8 are rated 'most.'
- Feasibility of mitigation is low for all except alternatives 2 and 3.
- Association with wetlands and streams increases permitting complexity.
- Potential impacts are not limited to habitat modification; there are potential indirect effects.
- Habitat elements must be incorporated into wetland stream mitigation efforts.

Discussion yielded the following points and questions:

- The assumed HCT alignment east of Bellevue is the same for both the SR 520 and I-90 corridors; an alignment choice was made for the purposes of the modeling, which will be revisited in more detail. The HCT design was much rougher than with the highway.
- Impacts discussed are primarily permanent impacts. There will be some additional impacts as a result of construction, and temporary water quality impacts. Five to ten extra feet on each side of the roadway were included in the footprint during the environmental analysis as an assumed construction impact zone.
- Field reconnaissance for impacted areas will be done during the EIS.
- A question was raised about the relatively large increase in affected acres as the width is increased from alternative 2 to alternative 3. Yet the increase from alternative 3 to alternative 8 is only one additional acre of impact. Margaret Clancy stated that this question would be followed up.
- A question was raised about the encroachment on Yarrow Bay wetlands and the Wetherill Nature Preserve; the sensitive areas tour had suggested there would be no impacts, though the environmental findings information states that there will be. Margaret Clancy stated that it is understood that there would be impacts to those two areas, but that there may be new ideas for avoidance that were not available for the analysis.
- Lorie Parker stated that the team has struggled with assessing the level of possible mitigation options as part of the evaluation, and that information is shown because it was requested. The ratings may be somewhat subjective, and the assumptions about mitigation opportunities may not be helpful information.
- Impacts listed are for new impacts, without accounting for removals of existing impacts.
- It was pointed out that wetlands exist on both sides of the roadway at Yarrow Bay.

- A question about quantifying ‘most’ and ‘medium’ impacts was raised, and whether it could be quantified in terms of number of affected specimens. Margaret Clancy stated that the rating system was constrained, and that a relative ranking of the alternatives under each criterion was created to partially address that constraint.
- Small changes in habitat in Lake Washington will affect only a small portion of total habitat, and therefore it will be difficult to predict a measurable impact there. Streams, however, will demonstrate measurable positive and negative impacts. Work in the lower end of Bear Creek has the potential to raise the temperature, and therefore interfere with migration in the 10’s of adult salmon. That effect, however, will not be permissible on a listed species.
- A question was raised about whether impacts to wetlands will be offset by the potential to fix current problems, such as direct water runoff into streams. Margaret Clancy stated that the no action alternative is considered no impact, and therefore alternative 2 will be beneficial with respect to certain specific criteria.
- A question was raised about the choice between ESA impacts and 4(f) impacts under the permitting process, as might be necessary in the Redmond area.
- The environmental analysis done thus far represents the worst-case scenario in most areas, assuming a horizontal spread of built facility. The EIS process will look at opportunities to redesign and avoid impacts, which would include stacking, for example, as a way of minimizing footprint.

## **BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

Bob Swope, CH2M Hill, presented the impacts to the parks and built environment, specifically along the SR 520 corridor. He explained the importance of the parks and recreation areas, and why impacts to those areas need to be considered in the design of the projects.

Section 4(f) of the 1966 US Department of Transportation Act protects public parks, recreation areas, trails, wildlife, waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. The act requires that impacts to these areas not be approved unless no other prudent avoidance alternative exists; requires planning to minimize harm; and applies to both direct and proximity impacts.

The City of Seattle Ordinance 118477 (1997) states that a park or other recreational facilities cannot be taken without a replacement in that area. In the City of Seattle, 3-6 areas of parkland will be impacted in seven parks regulated by the ordinance. The Olmstead plan for Seattle parks, boulevards, and playgrounds also holds strong historic and cultural significance in the city, though it is not an official regulation.

Bob Swope then reviewed the Seattle facilities that SR 520 is expected to affect, as well as the east side facilities. Discussion noted the following points and questions:

- Only public green space has been considered in the analysis. Privately owned green space, though an agreement with the city may preserve it as in Redmond, does not fall under the

same 4(f) regulations. Lorie Parker stated that it would be possible to map additional green spaces, which can be done in coordination with local jurisdictions.

- John Okamoto, WSDOT, stated that WSDOT has been very liberal in allowing jurisdictions to put trails through the WSDOT right-of-way. It would be unfortunate, and against the intent of the department, to have these trails fall under 4(f) designations. Such a process will make it less likely that WSDOT will continue to allow easements on the WSDOT right-of-way. Bob Swope stated that commuter trails are not 4(f) facilities, unless they are recreational trails.
- The SR 520 bicycle/pedestrian trail will probably be replaced by a similar trail, as will the Points Loop trail.
- The area immediately south of Fairweather Nature Preserve abutting SR 520 is owned by the school district, but maintained as part of the park.
- Trail relocation should be shown on design drawings so that public is aware the trail is not being removed.
- Trails in the WSDOT right-of-way should be clarified as pedestrian right-of-ways in making determinations for federal regulations.
- Information about open spaces and open space agreements in Redmond can be gathered, and the committees should determine how to consider it.
- The Town of Yarrow Point has maintained a trail originally built by WSDOT. The trail is part of a regional system and contained in the comprehensive town plan, and maintenance is part of that goal. How will this trail be considered, and how will new trails be maintained when completed?
- Net difference in impacts after determining what will be gained by removing existing structures would be helpful information.

## **NOISE**

Michael Minor, Michael Minor and Associates, presented a basic understanding of noise problems along a freeway to understand the differences between the alignments. Generally noise decreases by 6 decibels with a doubling of distance from a point source, and by 3-5 decibels for a line source. Hills, reflective items, trees, and other landscape features play a role. Traffic noise analysis is done using a one hour LEQ, which is the energy average over a one hour period based on the loudest part of the day, on dry pavement. Noise levels in excess of 66 decibels in residential areas and 71 decibels in commercial areas require mitigation investigation. Special consideration is given for schools and institutions. Noise measurements are made at five feet off the ground facing the noise source outside.

Michael Minor stated that noise levels along the length of the corridor would increase, but only by a few decibels. Generally noise increases by about 3 decibels for each 10 mph increase in

speed above 30 mph. A noise increase of 3 dB is noticeable, 5 dB is definitely noticeable, and 10 dB is a perceived doubling in loudness.

Predicted noise increases without mitigation under each of the alternatives are as follows:

Alternative 1 – Same as today; no huge increases

Alternative 2 – Slight widening, no increased capacity – at most 1 dB increase

Alternative 3 – Widening and slight increase in capacity – up to 3 dB in some locations

Alternative 4 – 3-5 dB increase, except where alignment is shifted

Alternative 5 – 3-5 dB increase, possibly lower on the side of fixed guideway facility

Alternative 6 – 4-6 dB increase, depending on side of roadway

Alternative 7 – 3-5 dB increase

Alternative 8 – 3-5, possibly 6 dB increase

Noise abatement measures include design options such as roadway depression, lids, alignment shifts, and traffic management measures. Once the roadway is designed, a model will determine noise levels at each location, and mitigation measures will be determined based on that. There is an objective of a 10 dB reduction for front line receivers. It is difficult to obtain more than a 12 dB reduction in noise.

Discussion yielded the following points and questions:

- Noise from light rail tracks, though it may be more annoying, can be easily mitigated by keeping smooth wheels, grinding rails, keeping rails straight, and with short noise walls right along the track. Squeal on sharp curves can be mitigated with dry lubricants.
- Monorail noise is more difficult to mitigate because the noise source is elevated. Other HCT technologies on fixed guideway systems can be fairly easily mitigated.
- Slower, congested traffic will act as a noise barrier for inner, faster moving HOV lanes. Analysis will occur assuming all lanes are freely moving.
- Different vehicle types are included in the analysis, using statistics for passenger vehicles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks provided by WSDOT.
- Length of maximum noise levels is not considered in the analysis.
- Trees and landscaping do enable some noise reduction, though it is not often used as mitigation.
- Noise walls close to roadway or close to the receiver are the most effective, though it is necessary to have residents' buy-off on noise wall placed outside of the right-of-way. Berms are used to create a barrier of a different surface between receivers and roadway.
- Hillsides and slopes present major noise mitigation challenges.

- Arterials may have more noise impacts than the freeways because space is not available for mitigation options.
- The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) noise mitigation is done for exterior land use, not interior areas. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) does mitigate for house interiors, and 24-hour noise analysis is done under FTA guidelines.
- A request was made for the project to look at the use of sound deadening pavements.

## **DISPLACEMENTS**

Lorie Parker reviewed the potential displacements and property takes across the corridor, emphasizing that it represented a worst-case scenario. The entire property boundaries of affected properties were shown, though the impact may only be to portions of the property. The assessment was made based solely on aerial photos and overlays. No field work has been done yet.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS SUMMARY**

As it is difficult to distinguish ratings on resources, the alternatives were rated in comparison to each other, with 1 being the worst or most effects, and 8 being the best or least effects. Lorie Parker reviewed the ratings for each of the following criteria:

- Displacements
- Land-use
- Visual quality
- Cultural resources
- Water resources

She then summarized the impacts. Least environmental impacts were in alternative 2. The second least were under alternative 7. The most impacts were under alternatives 6 and 8.

## **HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE FINDINGS**

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, presented the highway performance findings, with John Perlic, Parametrix, and Mike Horn, Parametrix. Jeff Peacock reviewed the results of the performance for the 4-, 6-, and 8-lane alternatives. Increases and decreases for each alternative are described relative to the effects of the no action scenario.

### **8-lane alternatives**

The 8-lane alternatives break down at I-5, as the off-ramps into I-5 or into downtown Seattle create conflicts. Movements would need to be separated, indicating a two-level structure across Portage Bay. Even with direct connections to I-5, excess GP traffic and not be put into I-5, though an additional 1000 vehicles an hour would desire to go there. Additional capacity on I-5 would need to be seriously considered.

Questions and points made during the presentation are noted below.

- The increase in trips described for the 6-lane alternatives is added to the increase in no action. For example, in the 4-lane alternative, person trips increase by 38,000. Under the 6-lane alternative, person trips increase by another 30,000 over no action, indicating a total increase over baseline of 68,000 person trips.
- Assumptions on I-405 of no increase in capacity shows the restrictions of the model: the travel times will decrease under the 6-lane alternatives because there is no additional capacity modeled on I-405, which restricts traffic getting onto SR 520.
- There are no additional trips onto I-5 being demonstrated in the models.
- The I-405/SR 520 creates serious complications from an engineering viewpoint. Direct connections in all directions are difficult to engineer. The interchange design would have to be much wider to accommodate all the connections.
- HOV lanes will not necessarily have priority. GP lanes in the merging areas will be a possibility to accommodate the lack of direct connections.
- Congestion in GP lanes in the 8-lane alternatives will also cause a significant shift to HOV travel.
- It was suggested that a matrix of comparisons of the alternatives and their performance be prepared.
- 8-lane alternatives will increase congestion, because adjoining facilities are not able to handle the increased capacity.

Jeff Peacock reviewed the graphic depictions of the system level operating characteristics across the corridor for both the AM and PM peak periods. The model allowed up to 19 time periods of 15 minutes each, allowing a 4.5-hour peak period. Existing conditions used 1995 statistics, all other alternative were projected for 2020.

The Safety and Preservation alternative quantified the capacity increase, which was notable. The performance increases were not significant when annualized, but on an incident-by-incident basis there is a big difference.

Under the 6-lane alternative, I-405 traffic is not getting onto SR 520, and therefore SR 520 performs remarkably well. When the PPA for I-405 is incorporated in the model, the GP traffic performance will approach the no action scenario.

The highway function results show the actual volume served, as a result of the rest of the conditions on the highway for westbound and eastbound. The numbers are lower because of the constraints of the facilities feeding SR 520. The eastside volume at SR 202 is at capacity under the no action and all build alternatives.

- The model did pick up some of the changes in the length of the safety and preservation congestion period, but not to any level of detail since the model is calibrated with traffic counts, which is influenced by traffic conditions. On a day-to-day basis, the safety and preservation performance could be markedly increased.
- The facilities perform well when people are unable to get to that facility. The needs of local traffic and impacts need to be balanced with those of SR 520.
- It was suggested that the HOV and HCT be shown against the no action as a comparison to show the resulting behavior changes. TDM incentives then could demonstrate improvements in GP without widening the corridor. Jeff Peacock stated that such an analysis would raise plenty of questions since it would be so complicated.
- A tunnel into Eastlake would eliminate the “Mercer weave,” by separating the Montlake/Eastlake movements. This would be a side benefit of the project, though it is not one of the project goals. The Eastlake tunnel alternative is complicated by the presence of the Montlake on-ramp.
- It was suggested that person throughput numbers also be displayed for comparison with volume input. This requires assumptions about average vehicle occupancy.
- It was also suggested that mode split be displayed.
- A suggestion was made for bridge lanes not having an HOV restriction, and HOV was given priority for getting onto the facility. Jeff Peacock stated that the resulting situation would be similar to the current situation approaching the bridge westbound, and effects would ripple upstream.

## **LOCAL TRAFFIC IMPACTS**

Eric Shimizu and Sandra Fann, Parametrix, assisted Jeff Peacock in presenting the local traffic impacts. Jeff Peacock reviewed the key findings for the local traffic impacts for the 6- and 8-lane alternatives. Included in the analysis were existing projects or projects that have funding as part of the local system. Generally, added capacity on SR 520 reveals that the local arterials are overwhelmed, and a discussion was begun with local jurisdictions to figure out how to handle that.

A list of projects that would need to be considered to address local impacts includes:

- A second crossing of the Montlake Cut and grade separating Pacific St./Montlake Blvd.
- Grade separating Eastlake/Fairview, and possibly Valley/Fairview.
- Widen Lake Washington Blvd. into Kirkland.
- Separate movements at W. Lake Sammamish Pkwy.
- Widening 148<sup>th</sup> Ave NE in Bellevue.
- Widening Leary Way, Redmond Way, and Union Hill Road.

Local traffic models used commonly in the region were used to determine a level of service analysis, and assign an A-F grade to a particular area or intersection. A snapshot was provided for both morning and afternoon periods. No information was given about the length of the backups at the particular intersections.

A fair number of interchanges and arterials are degraded with additional GP capacity. Suggestions will seek to get back to the level of service predicted under the no action scenario.

Points and questions noted in the discussion are summarized below:

- \$100 million was assumed in the cost estimates for local street improvements without knowing exactly what those projects would be.
- It was suggested that access to SR 99 be considered with any alternatives providing direct access into the Eastlake area.
- Priority to the major traffic flow from UW would be given to a second crossing of the Montlake Cut.
- It was suggested that local street improvements might not work, still resulting in overwhelmed arterials. Jeff Peacock stated that the analysis has been as objective as possible, and that the team realizes there are some real problems associated with the 8-lane alternatives. He requested that the committee members refrain from drawing conclusions until the analysis is more complete.
- It was noted that an additional southbound lane on West Lake Sammamish Parkway with an overpass to Redmond Way would improve how the volume of traffic gets to the freeway. These changes will be addressed in the local jurisdictional meetings.
- It was noted that the picture doesn't portray what happens with the I-405 scenarios, which may make a difference about how big a sacrifice is made with or without I-405. The analysis up to this point has assumed no action at the I-405 interchange.
- Without a bridge or tunnel at Montlake, the no action scenario performs the best.

## **MULTI-MODAL ANALYSIS CONCLUSIONS**

Jeff Peacock reviewed the major findings coming out of the multi-modal analysis for the 4-, 6-, and 8-lane alternatives. The 4-lane alternatives were recommended for the EIS because of the level of impacts. The 6-lane alternatives should also be included in the EIS.

The 8-lane alternatives showed that person and vehicular throughputs increase throughout the day, but the congestion periods shift. These also have the highest level of impacts to the natural environment and to the local arterials. WSDOT is interested in making the freeway operate as it should, but the interchanges will need to be worked out with the local jurisdictions. The 8-lane alternatives also have significantly higher costs, and added traffic at I-5 as well as at the arterials

is problematic. There are further questions about the 8-lane alternatives, and a recommendation will be difficult to make until some of these are sorted out.

BRT/HOV alternatives show throughput similar to HCT over the next 20 years, though a significant degradation of the facility is projected into the out-years. Even though it could be managed at some level, it would be difficult to maintain efficient function of BRT service. A major transit center would be required in both the University District and downtown Seattle to handle the volume of buses into those areas.

HCT on SR 520 provides additional HCT capacity into downtown Seattle, and if a merge into the LINK system were not possible, a transfer would be accommodated. HCT on I-90 takes advantage of existing infrastructure investments across the lake, between the lake and downtown Seattle, and in the downtown tunnel.

- The question was raised about why the focus is on vehicle throughput, as opposed to person throughput. The longer the congestion, the more people would shift into HOV and transit.
- Don Billen, Sound Transit, clarified that the BRT did not include bus intercept facilities for this alternatives. If there were street restrictions in downtown Seattle beyond the closure of the bus tunnel, BRT could work through 2020. Beyond that, it would be likely that major facilities would be necessary.
- It was suggested that BRT does not function as a *rapid* transit system if it shares the roadway in many places, and facilities to get in and out of downtown Seattle are not created.
- It was noted that if Sound Transit does not get to Northgate, a real problem exists in getting more buses onto SR 520. The complexity will need to involve more discussion on timing, phasing, and probability of particular outcomes for some of these decisions.
- A suggestion was made for HCT to tunnel into Fremont, then Queen Anne. If half the trains from SR 520 merged into the LINK line to downtown Seattle, and the other half went through Fremont and lower Queen Anne, then the capacity from SR 520 could be handled in two lines to downtown.
- Phased HCT from the SR 520 could transfer with the LINK line if a tunnel ran under the Montlake cut. Eventually, to accommodate demand the SR 520 line would need to get to downtown.

Jeff Peacock reviewed the additional questions that need to be addressed:

- Integration with other large corridor projects, including I-90, I-405, LINK light rail, and I-5.
- Light rail options on I-90, including pricing as a means to control volumes, rail and I-90 geometry, and a parallel HCT crossing at I-90
- Should the right-of-way for HCT be preserved on SR 520, which has implications for NEPA and costs?

- Other options available to deal with local traffic impacts, including grade separations, widenings, and local access restrictions.
- Other options for handling traffic volumes at I-5, including different connections and termini, widening I-5, and pricing to control volumes.
- Other options available in the I-405 interchange area, including the effect of added capacity on I-405, maintaining HOV direct access in all directions, and consolidation of interchanges between 108<sup>th</sup> and 124<sup>th</sup> Ave.

## **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

General discussion at the end of the meeting noted the following points:

- King Cushman, PSRC, suggested that the terminology 'pricing to control volumes' be replaced with language indicating that pricing would be used to balance supply and demand and generate critical revenue for improvements. Highways are the only publicly financed facilities not based on use, and a recently adopted regional policy will encourage pricing strategies based on use.
- A concern was raised that jurisdictions would be committing to local impacts for which implications are not known, since information is unavailable on how local interchanges could work.
- Though there are currently a lot of unresolved questions about I-405 and local impacts, those questions will remain if a decision on which alternatives to include in the EIS is delayed. A decision will need to be made even if there is not adequate information. It was suggested however, that a consensus decision in September 2001, would be preferable to a forced decision in July 2001.
- Waiting to make a decision on the EIS alternatives until fall, 2001, should not impair the project's ability to get to a ROD by the first quarter of 2003.
- If lanes built on SR 520 for HCT are used in the interim for another purpose, a situation similar to I-90 may result where it will be difficult to change use from its existing form to its originally intended form.
- It was suggested the model should be able to pick up the result of added shoulders on SR 520 in its performance, if the congestion at interchanges and engineering deficiencies can be seen in model results.
- More information in subsequent meetings may not change opinions about what should be carried into the EIS, especially as the alternatives do not represent the final decision. The same information can be used to reach very different conclusions.
- There were several voices raised in support of delaying a decision about EIS alternatives until September to gain consensus.

- It was suggested that issues be identified for what is needed to make the decision by September. A schedule for how Trans-Lake would fit with the projected schedules for I-90, I-5, and I-405 projects would be helpful. A work program of the questions, timeframe, and decision framework to get to a point of consensus is necessary.
- It was suggested that the I-405 preferred preliminary alternative be used to look at the interchange problem at I-405.
- John Okamoto, WSDOT, voiced support for gaining consensus, but also voiced concern about being intentional about a deadline in order to meet the ambitious schedule. A timeframe should be established to work hard and discuss what works among the communities, narrow the options, and move forward for the region as a whole.
- Delays to look at the substance and information that will drive the decisions are fine. If a delay is based on political maneuvering, then the outcome will be the same. Honest conversations across the lake about what needs to go forward, and what needs to happen on I-90, are necessary.
- The region will need to have public consensus on a financial plan for this and other projects. The financing subcommittee will meet again in July 2001.

## **NEXT STEPS**

Additional committee discussion of the multi-modal alternatives evaluation results and questions will be considered in the committee meetings on June 18, 19, and June 27, 2001 for the Advisory, Technical, and Executive Committees respectively.

## **MEETING HANDOUTS**

- Agenda
- Multi-modal Alternatives Evaluation - Environmental Findings, report, June 7, 2001
- Wetlands/Shorelines, Priority Habitats/Species, Fisheries Issues, presentation, June 13, 2001
- Environmental Findings - Built Environment, June 13, 2001
- Environmental Findings - Noise, June 13, 2001
- Highway Performance Findings, presentation, June 2001
- Local Traffic Findings, presentation, June 2001
- Multi-Modal Alternatives Analysis Conclusions, presentation, June 2001
- Review of Eight Pre-Final Alternatives, prepared by Jim MacIsaac, Advisory Committee, June 10, 2001

## **MEETING ATTENDEES**

### *Executive Committee Members*

<b>Present</b>	<b>Name</b>		<b>Organization</b>
X	Becker	Daniel	City of Medina
X	Berry	Jeanne	Town of Yarrow Point
	Cairns	Bryan	City of Mercer Island
X	Clarke	Chuck	City of Seattle
	Conlin	Richard	City of Seattle
	Crawford	Jack	Sound Transit Board
X	Davis	Aubrey	Washington Transportation Commission
	Earling	Dave	Sound Transit Board
	Edwards	Bob	Puget Sound Regional Council
	Hughes	Gary	Federal Highway Administration
X	Ganz	Nona	City of Kirkland
	Gehrke	Linda	Federal Transit Administration
X	Grigsby	Daryl	City of Seattle
	Horn	Jim	Washington State Senate
X	Ives	Rosemarie	City of Redmond
	Jacobsen	Ken	Washington State Senate
X	Marshall	Connie	City of Bellevue
X	Martin	George	City of Clyde Hill
X	McConkey	Fred	Town of Hunts Point
	McIver	Richard	City of Seattle
X	McKenna	Rob	King County Council
	Murray	Ed	WA State House of Representatives
X	Noble	Phil	City of Bellevue
X	Okamoto	John	WSDOT - NW Region
	Pflug	Cheryl	WA State House of Representatives
X	Sullivan	Cynthia	King County Council
	Taniguchi	Harold	King County Department of Transportation

### *Executive Committee Alternates*

<b>Present</b>	<b>Name</b>		<b>Organization</b>
X	Asher	David	City of Kirkland
X	Bowman	Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Drais	Dan	FTA
	Carpenter	Trish	Town of Hunts Point
	McKenzie	Jack	Town of Hunts Point
	Creighton	Mike	City of Bellevue
	Demitriades	Paul	City of Medina
	Dye	Dave	WSDOT - NW Region
	Earl	Joni	Sound Transit
	Hague	Jane	King County Council

	Jahncke	El	City of Mercer Island
	Conrad	Richard	City of Mercer Island
	Kargianis	George	Washington Transportation Commission
X	Paine	Thomas	City of Redmond
X	Rourke	Philip	City of Clyde Hill
	Rutledge	Steve	City of Yarrow Point
X	Switaj	Ed	City of Seattle

### *Technical Committee Members*

<b>Present</b>	<b>Name</b>		<b>Organization</b>
X	Arndt	Jim	City of Kirkland
	Billen	Don	Sound Transit
X	Bowman	Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Brooks	Allyson	Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
	Conrad	Richard	City of Mercer Island
X	Cushman	King	Puget Sound Regional Council
X	Dewey	Peter	University of Washington
	Fisher	Larry	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
X	(Steve	Kalinowski)	
	Gibbons	Tom	National Marine Fisheries Service
	Kennedy	Jack	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
	Kenny	Ann	Washington Department of Ecology
X	Kircher	Dave	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
X	Leonard	Jim	Federal Highway Administration
X	Marpert	Terry	City of Redmond
X	Martin	Ann	King County Department of Transportation
X	Newstrum	Len	Town of Yarrow Point
	Pratt	Austin	U.S. Coast Guard, 13 <sup>th</sup> District
X	Rave	Krista	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
X	Sanchez	Susan	City of Seattle
X	Schulze	Doug	City of Medina
	Sparrman	Goran	City of Bellevue
X			(Bernard van de Kamp)
X	Sullivan	Maureen	WSDOT – NW Region
	Teachout	Emily	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
X	Wasserman	Mitch	City of Clyde Hill
X	Willis	Joe	Town of Hunts Point

### *Advisory Committee Members*

<b>Present</b>		
X	Amick	Jean
	Andrews	Deborah
X	Aschenbach	Hans
	Beltz	Allison
	Culp	Barbara
	Dent	Bob
X	Eades	Bertha

	Gatchet	Dan
X	Gunby	Virginia
	Hallenbeck	Mark
	Hart	Fred
	Hill	Jim
X	Hill	Gregory
	Holman	Linda
	Hurley	Peter
X	Joneson	Kingsley
X	Leed	Jean
X	MacIsaac	Jim
	Newstrum	Elizabeth
	Odell	Nina
	Ray	Janet
X	Reckers, Jr.	James
X	Resha	John
X	Sheck	Ronald
	Stelle	Claudia
X	Tate	Bob
	Tochterman	Thomas B.
X	Wasserman	Eugene
	Weed	Mark
	White	Rich
X	White	Roland
	Wyble	John

#### *Other attendees*

Maurice Cooper, Madison Park  
Philip Grega, Seattle  
Chris Johnson, King County Council  
Jonathan Dubman, Montlake  
John Maloff, Laurelhurst  
Maynard Arsove  
Kim Becklund, City of Bellevue  
Andrew Schmid, King County Council

#### *Project Team*

Les Rubstello, WSDOT  
Rob Fellows, WSDOT  
Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit  
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix  
Don Billen, Sound Transit  
Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill  
Aleen Wilson, CH2M Hill  
Margaret Clancy, Parametrix  
Don Weitkamp, Parametrix  
Michael Minor, Michael Minor and Associates  
Jeff Brauns, Parametrix  
Lindsay Yamane, Parametrix  
Dave Hilderbrant, Parametrix

Cathy Strombom, Parsons Brinckerhoff  
Jane Farquharson, PSTC  
Daryl Wendle, Parametrix  
Tom Hamstra, Parametrix  
Kim Farley, WSDOT  
Sandra Fann, Parametrix  
Mike Horn, Parametrix  
Eric Shimizu, CH2M Hill  
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues  
Amy Grotefendt, EnviroIssues  
Paul Hezel, EnviroIssues  
Tung Lee, CH2M Hill

PJH